

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, and 18 have been canceled. Claims 7, 8, 10, 12-17, 23, and 19-30 are currently amended.

The examiner has objected to claims 7, 8, 10, 12-17, 23, and 19-30 for various informalities. All of the examiner's suggestions for rectifying those informalities have been adopted and the objection should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 10, 12-17, 23, and 26 have been rejected for indefiniteness based on uncertainty as to whether the language "a plurality of subframe structures", followed by recitation of "first" and "second" subframe structures, clearly connotes that more than two subframe structures are intended. The applicant indeed intends that the claims read on instances of two or more subframe structures. Thus, the independent claims have been amended to recite "at least a second" subframe structure, where there must be a first and at least a second subframe structure, but more will also do.¹

Claims 23 and 26 are further rejected for indefiniteness based on use of the term "assigning" in a manner that suggests the "assigning" steps are part of a method being performed. It is submitted that the deletion of those terms and amendments to the second and third subparagraphs of claims 23 and 26 now render the first and second "instance" limitations as locational rather than functional.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7, 8, 10, 12-17, 23, and 26 for indefiniteness be withdrawn.

The application is now in condition for allowance, early notification of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



TERRANCE A. MEADOR
Reg. No. 30, 298

Date: December 7, 2007

INCAPLAW
1050 Rosecrans Street, Suite K
San Diego, CA 92106

Telephone: (619) 222-2531 Fax: (619) 222-2327

¹ See Robert C. Farber, *Landis on Mechanics of Patent Claim Drafting*, Fourth edition, Release 1 (November 1997), pages III-17 through III-19.